



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,920	03/31/2004	Bruce G. Woodward	SYB/0106.01	2919
31779	7590	11/03/2009	EXAMINER	
JOHN A. SMART 201 LOS GATOS SARATOGA RD, #161 LOS GATOS, CA 95030-5308				MADAMBA, CLIFFORD B
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3696				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/03/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/708,920	WOODWARD ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	CLIFFORD MADAMBA	3696

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10/23/09 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Hani M. Kazimi/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments/remarks filed on October 23, 2009 are still applicable to the references/rejections discussed in the Office Action dated May 8, 2008 as follows:

With regard to the Win reference, Applicant argues that Win's access control system does not include a comparable hierarchical entitlement structure with inheritance, nor does it relate to the performance of financial transactions. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and points out that the limitation is disclosed by Win as follows:

Win discloses a method comprising storing information that defines administration roles, that associates a user with one or more of the administration roles, and that associates each administration role with one or more administrative privileges (Abstract). The invention relates to methods, apparatus, and products for managing and administering a system for facilitating secure and selective access to network resources based on a role of a user of the resources (Column 1, lines 18-24). Win goes on to define the administration of privileges as follows: "An administrative privilege authorizes at least one administrative function. When the user requests the execution of an administrative function, the request is honored only when one of the user's administrative roles includes an administrative privilege that authorizes the requested administrative function." (Abstract).

Win further discloses rules for defining roles for users when working for an organization as follows: "A Role may reflect a relationship of a User to the organization (employee, customer, distributor, supplier), their department within an organization (sales, marketing, engineering) or any other affiliation or function...that defines their information needs and thus their access rights or privileges...In some embodiments, the term User Type or Person Type refers to employees, directors, officers, contractors, customers, distributors, etc., and Role refers to a job function such as sales representative, financial analyst, etc." (Column 5, lines 2-8 & lines 18-21). Thus, as the disclosure described by Win above pertains to the usage of administrative privileges and authorizations with regard to the performance of specific functions within an organization, and, as such functions includes the user role of a financial analyst implicitly performing a finance-related function, it is therefore clear that the limitation of privileges and limitations for performing financial transactions is taught by Win.

The Office thus asserts that the above argued feature is sufficiently disclosed in substance by the cited reference in view of the current language of the claim recitation.

Applicant further argues that Win makes no mention of a hierarchical entitlements structure in which a particular entitlement group has a child entitlement group. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and points out that the limitation is disclosed by Win as follows:

Win discloses a mechanism for governing access to information resources in which selective access is given to particular users (Column 2, lines 25-27) wherein the administration of access control to resources is selectively delegated to multiple administrators (Column 2, lines 35-36). The selective delegation of access privileges by itself denotes a hierarchical structure within an organization where access is granted to some and not to others depending on the relationship of a user with an organization and the roles played within the organization as follows: "User are individuals who have a relationship with an organization and play various roles, and are registered in the system." (Column 4, lines 22-25). "Roles are defined by information identifying a name of a role and by a functional group in which the role resides. A functional group is often a department in which similar function exists. Examples of functional groups are Marketing, Sales, Engineering, Human Resources, and Operations. In some embodiments, the term User Type or Person Type refers to employees, directors, officers...etc." (Column 5, lines 12-21).

Win further discloses the passing on or "inheriting" of access or entitlement privileges within an organization with the following example: "Any user who is assigned the role of "Sales Manager" in the future will automatically have access to the "National Sales Report" resource. If the administrator later un-assigns "Sales Manager" from the "National Sales Report" resource, then all users associated with the "Sales Manager" role will automatically lose access to the resource." (Column 18, lines 25-34). Win clearly teaches the limitation comprising a hierarchical entitlement structure with inheritance.

The Office thus asserts that the above argued feature is sufficiently disclosed in substance by the cited reference in view of the current language of the claim recitation.

With regard to the Rowe reference, Applicant argues that Rowe's value limit is a single number associated with a given financial account (e.g., bank account) and is not a limit that is tied to an entitlement group. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and points out that the limitation is disclosed by Win as follows:

Rowe discloses wherein both transaction limits as well as cumulative limits are established for a financial transaction as follows: "In a step S1e, the account provider assigns the account with a maximum funds value or value limit... Most often, the maximum value will comprise the amount of an initial deposit into the account by the customer." (Paragraph 40) In this case, a deposit into the account is allowed to accumulate up to the maximum deposit limit ("cumulative limit") set by the account provider for the account. Also, the maximum number of transactions permitted ("per transaction limit") is limited only by the number of deposit transactions necessary to fund the account up to the maximum amount permitted for the account.

Rowe also teaches wherein transaction limits are imposed by the account provider as follows: "This method comprises the steps of: providing customer data to the account provider, establishing an account type, assigning a value limit for the account, depositing funds in the financial account in an amount not exceeding the value limit, assigning the financial account an expiration date after which access to the financial account is generally prohibited by a user..." (Abstract). In this case, the expiration date set by the account provider for

transacting with the financial account serves the same purpose as limiting the number of transactions permitted for the account.

In another instance, Rowe discloses wherein transaction limits and cumulative limits for the account provider to follow are set by the user of the account for as follows: "The customer may arrange the account such that funds are debited and transferred to the charity [or any other account] at one or more predetermined times and for one or more predetermined amounts." (Paragraph 35) In this case, an account is permitted to be transacted upon only during the periods or times set for transacting whereas the maximum amount(s) permitted during the processing of the account is limited by the user.

The Office thus asserts that the above argued feature is sufficiently disclosed in substance by the cited reference in view of the current language of the claim recitation.

With regard to the Barkley reference, Applicant argues that Barkley takes a bottom-up, rather than a top-down, approach to inheritance, and thus, Barkley in fact teaches away from Applicant's top-down inheritance approach. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and points out that the limitation is disclosed by Win as follows:

Barkley discloses wherein permissions are inherited by an entitlement group from its parent entitlement group in a hierarchical entitlement structure as follows: "The capability for one role to inherit another role - that is, for example, while members of "manager" have their own permissions, they may also inherit those of "subordinate" - is a common feature of RBAC models. Such a "role hierarchy" is implemented by a strict partial ordering on the set of roles. One can think of role inheritance as the capability for one role to be authorized for (or "included in") another role." (Column 9, lines 48-55); "Similarly, the members of branch\_manager have permission to read the accounts directory and account files, and to read and delete suggestion files, as noted above, while the members of employee have permission to read all employee files, but do not have permission to access files or directories associated with Object Access Type accounts." (Column 12, lines 7-12). As such, Barkley's approach to inheritance describes an inheritance structure wherein roles occupying a higher level in the organization (e.g. "branch\_manager") are permitted greater access privileges compared to roles occupying lower levels within the same organization (e.g. "members of employee") whose access privileges are more restricted. Thus Barkley's inheritance approach teaches a "top-down" inheritance methodology.

The Office thus asserts that the above argued feature is sufficiently disclosed in substance by the cited reference in view of the current language of the claim recitation..